

From: <Andrew.Johnson@csiro.au>
Subject: **Response to your letter of 25 January**
Date: 14 March 2011 1:51:00 PM AEST
To: <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Cc: <Annemaree.Lonergan@csiro.au>

Dear Mr Roberts

Thank you for your email on 25 January requesting evidence of the relationship between human production of carbon dioxide and global warming. My apologies it has taken so long to respond to you.

All measurements of the climate system indicate the long term warming trend is continuing. For more information on why global warming has not stopped, please see www.csiro.au/news/Has-Global-Warming-Stopped.html, and the World Meteorological Organization's statement at www.wmo.int/pages/mediacentre/press_releases/pr_906_en.html.

There is evidence that the Earth's climate has warmed over the last century. Warming is apparent in a range of climate indicators including increasing temperatures over land and in the oceans, and increases in sea level. For more information, please see a snapshot of the state of the climate released last year by CSIRO and the Bureau of Meteorology at www.csiro.au/resources/State-of-the-Climate.html.

There are a number of key anthropogenic climate change fingerprints that have been positively identified in the instrumental record. For a summary of these, and a link to the relevant peer-reviewed sources, please see www.csiro.au/news/Climate-Variability--ci_pageNo-2.html. There is evidence that the observed changes to the climate system are consistent with changes expected due to increasing greenhouse gases. It is very likely that most of the warming over the last 60 years is due to increases in greenhouse gas emissions due to human activity. For more detail regarding the relationship between carbon dioxide and temperature, please see the information and references at www.csiro.au/news/Climate-Change-Water-Vapour--ci_pageNo-2.html.

I trust this information will assist you.

Yours sincerely

Dr Andrew Johnson
Group Executive - Environment
CSIRO
Ecosciences Precinct
GPO Box 46
Brisbane QLD 4001
Phone: 07 38335520; 0419 759 616
<http://www.csiro.au/>

From: Malcolm Roberts [mailto:catalyst@eis.net.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 25 January 2011 5:36 PM
To: Johnson, Andrew (Group Exec, Dutton Park); Lonergan, Annemaree (OCE, Campbell)
Subject: Fwd: Professor Karoly, your flood of comments is harming real people

Dr Megan Clark, CSIRO Chief Executive
and, Dr Andrew Johnson, Group Executive—Environment

Dear Dr Clark and Dr Johnson:

Given our past correspondence mentioned in the e-mail forwarded below, the e-mail will likely be of interest to you.

Can you yet provide me with specific scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused Earth's latest, modest cyclic warming that ended around 1998?

Malcolm Roberts
(Contact details provided below)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Date: 25 January 2011 1:25:54 PM AEST
To: David Karoly <dkaroly@unimelb.edu.au>, stewart.franks@newcastle.edu.au
Cc: andy.pitman@gmail.com, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg <oveh@uq.edu.au>, tim.flannery@mq.edu.au, chancellor@unimelb.edu.au, vc@unimelb.edu.au
Bcc:
Subject: Professor Karoly, your flood of comments is harming real people

Copied to
University of Melbourne
Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor.
Their action will reveal standards to which they aspire for science and for their university.

G'day David:

On Thursday, January 13th, 2011 ABC-TV broadcast across Australia your unfounded falsities implying Queensland's latest floods were caused by human production of carbon dioxide, CO2. Remembering the tragic circumstances and deaths at the time I feel sad, hurt and annoyed. To meet needs for integrity, responsibility, respect and care please explain your assertions.

Are you aware that your unfounded statements and implied falsities on weather events seem to be misleading people into devastation and exposing them to needless high risk?

1. Real-world data exposes your explicit and implicit claims as false. If you disagree, please provide real-world evidence.

Lets analyse your chain of falsities starting with your 2003 claims and implied claims.

eg. your January 14th, 2003 statement about droughts, quote: "This is the first drought in Australia where the impact of human-induced global warming can be clearly observed."

http://qualenergia.it/UserFiles/Files/CI_IC_EE_03_Global_Warming_2003.pdf

(From "Global warming contributes to Australia's worst drought", a document co-authored by you and published by the activist group WWF.)

In making your statement, **were you not aware that Australia has had drier periods in our nation's recent past?**

http://www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/climate/change/timeseries.cgi?graph=rain&area=aus&season=0112&ave_yr=0

Focussing on Eastern Australia:

http://www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/climate/change/timeseries.cgi?graph=rain&area=eaus&season=0112&ave_yr=0

Can you please explain where the impact of human-induced global warming can be "clearly observed" in our recent drought? Can you explain how it differs from previous droughts and especially from the 1901

Federation Drought that was far harsher?

Your WWF document provides no proof. From that document I conclude that you fail to understand scientific causality.

Are you not aware that some past droughts had relatively greater impact on our nation because Australia was then more reliant on the rural sector? Does your statement allow for inflation and for relative sizes of Australia's past and current economies? Did you knowingly make statements out of context, David?

Are you really implying that 50 years is a representative period? As a meteorologist you have easy access to 110 years of data since federation, don't you? Why did you choose a period of only 50 years?

Even for that short period of 50 years, by glancing at the Bureau of Meteorology's graph it seems your statement is false. Why did you make this falsity?

From your statements, I conclude that a journalist, Andrew Bolt, has sounder understanding of Australia's droughts and floods than do you.

http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/karolys_global_warming_wetter_drier_worse_better_whatever/

Of greater importance than one's profession are one's reliance—or otherwise—on facts and one's intent. Mr Bolt's intent is clearly focussed on understanding the truth by relying on facts. Your claims though contradict the facts—repeatedly.

2. Droughts are broken by ... rain. Australia's history shows repeatedly that it is common for droughts to be broken by floods.

In the past 170 years Brisbane has experienced six floods that reached levels higher than did our city's latest flood. During the same period the Bremer River flowing beside Ipswich and into the Brisbane River has had many, many floods. Check for yourself: http://www.bom.gov.au/hydro/flood/qld/fld_history/brisbane_history.shtml

From the Bureau of Meteorology graph, please note the relatively higher frequency of floods in the Brisbane River during the period 1840 to 1900 and the relatively high frequency of Bremer River floods during the period 1945 to 1990. Both rivers experienced a relatively high frequency of **major** floods in the period 1885-1900.

Referring to your comments broadcast by ABC-TV, did you miss this data from the Bureau of Meteorology? Or did you ignore it?

David, I conclude from the data that your statements about floods cannot be trusted. It seems your statements tell us little about floods yet reveal much about you. ie, the data reveal you are publicly and implicitly spreading falsities.

From an Australian Bureau of Meteorology report into the 1974 Brisbane floods, quote: *However, [four floods well in excess of the 1974 levels have occurred in the past 133 years](#) and, according to the Professor of Economic Geology at the University of Queensland (Professor Sergeant), there is geological **evidence** of water levels 5.5 m higher than the 1974 flood in the Indooroopilly area of Brisbane. Meteorological studies suggest that rainfalls well in excess of those recorded in the floods of 1893 and 1974 are possible.*

(http://www.bom.gov.au/hydro/flood/qld/fld_reports/brisbane_jan1974.pdf)

At the top of page 15, the Bureau forecast future events similar to those of the past.

As an aside, David, can you recall what else occurred in the year when the Bureau made its forecast of future floods continuing as normal? 1974 is the year that the media and some of your UN IPCC academic supporters and colleagues were inciting unfounded alarm about their forecast imminent, irreversible, catastrophic **global freezing** blamed on human use of coal and oil.

Nature brushes aside academics fomenting unfounded global catastrophe. Nature controls global climate and her ways are revealed by real-world data.

Sadly, when water at natural flood levels enters a natural flood plain, any dwellings built in the flood plain are ... flooded. Naturally.

David, based on the real-world data, it's clear that our current floods are entirely normal and natural. If you disagree, please provide real-world evidence.

You seem to be in apparent ignorance of the fact that in the real-world droughts are often broken by floods. You were reported by Associate Professor Stewart Franks thus: "*Professor Karoly stressed individual events could not be attributed to climate change. But the wild extremes being experienced by the continent were in keeping with scientists' forecasts of more flooding associated with increased heavy rain and more droughts as a result of high temperatures and more evaporation.*"

Associate Professor Stewart Franks is a scientifically published expert on El Nino and La Nina. He says your statement and what it implies in the context in which you made it about flooding being evidence of human induced global warming are typical of, quote: "

a common confusion made by those who have not studied the interaction of the land surface hydrology and atmosphere, as Prof. Karoly has not.

"

Given that an expert on the topic reveals you are not an expert, why did you make any statement at all? Given that you chose to speak, why did you broadcast a controversial and unfounded statement fomenting alarm? Why did you contradict the real-world data?

3. Why are you fomenting fear using falsities in an area in which you apparently lack expertise?

Associate Professor Stewart Franks has, quote: "*published a number of papers in the top-ranked international peer-reviewed literature regarding the role of La Nina in dictating Eastern Australian floods.*"

Further, he states that you are, quote: "*someone without any publication nor insight in this key area of concern for Australia.*" Based on this and especially on comments above and below, I conclude your public offerings on this are mere speculation. In my view they are further tainted by your personal financial interest in perpetuating UN IPCC fraud falsely claiming that global warming was caused by human production of CO₂.

http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/karolys_global_warming_wetter_drier_worse_better_whatever/

(The dictionary defines fraud as: presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain)

4. For 14 months, in your written responses to my correspondence you have repeatedly failed to provide real-world evidence of human CO₂ causing global warming. Why?

Can you yet provide any specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence that global warming was caused by human production of carbon dioxide, CO₂?

Chapter 9 of the UN IPCC's 2007 report is the chapter claiming human production of CO₂ caused global warming. It contains no real-world scientific evidence.

Given your lead role in concocting that chapter devoid of evidence, your repeated failure to provide evidence of your claim is not surprising.

Nonetheless, it is disturbing. And revealing.

David, have you heard of Dorothea McKellar's poem entitled "My Country"? It's well known among Aussies. Please refer to her poem's second verse.

<http://www.dorotheamakellar.com.au/archive/mycountry.htm>

Centuries of real-world experience and modern scientific data contradict your explicit and implicit claims that unusual events are occurring.

Secondly, there is no proof of any causal relationship between CO2 and extreme weather events. In reality, these events are normal and part of a long-established natural pattern in Australia.

History and science show the recent Brisbane floods are not unusual. They're typical. The floods were produced by weather that is part of an entirely normal pattern of events seen throughout Brisbane's past. The events were forecast in 1974 by the Bureau of Meteorology to be repeated in the future. Mere months prior to the recent floods the Bureau forecast such weather as imminent.

Maybe you could start afresh by contacting Associate Professor Stewart Franks, an expert on La Nina weather patterns, El Nino, droughts, floods and natural variability. Although I have not spoken with Associate Professor Franks, this e-mail is copied to him for your convenience.

http://www.expertguide.com.au!/AProfStewartFranks!_5570.aspx

Maybe you could access records of the area almost two centuries ago when John Oxley explored what is now Brisbane. The aboriginal residents of the day understood that Brisbane was prone to floods and apparently advised early settlers of that. Instead of relying on computer model projections they relied on real-world observations.

(<http://www.ourindooroopilly.com/brisbane-history.html> and see 'floods')

5. Your recent and earlier statements invite additional questions:

- Has the distraction of unfounded and fraudulent claims about global warming distracted governments and officials from protecting citizens?**
- Has your unfounded serial fomenting of alarm misled people into making decisions contrary to the facts and thereby jeopardising their homes, livelihood and lives?**

These are deadly serious questions, David.

I'll break them down for you into smaller questions.

5.1 If flood insurers reject victims' payout claims, should flood victims submit their reconstruction bills to you for payment?

On Friday night, January 21, 2011, ABC-TV broadcast a News Special on the Brisbane Floods. One of the flood victims participating, Anthony Marks, said of his family's decision to buy a property in the flood plain: "Our insurance policy was years of drought ...".

(<http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/> and then search for Leigh Sales, 7:30 Report, 21.01.11, Flood Special)

In recent years there has been a flood of political spin and media hype based on people such as you promoting yourself as experts on climate. Given the media's vigour in spreading alarming claims, **how were people such as Anthony Marks to know that weather event claims such as yours were based on falsities, lacked scientific evidence and contradicted scientific observations and history?**

5.2 Should politicians and dam operators hold you accountable for distracting them from real-world issues?

Responsible articles and reports appeared during and after the floods questioning whether the action of Wivenhoe

Dam operators exacerbated the flooding. Specifically, were the operators under pressure to maintain water supplies because of political pressure driven by ceaseless fomenting of unfounded alarm about droughts supposedly caused by human production of carbon dioxide?

(<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/damned-if-they-do-damned-if-they-dont/story-e6frg6zo-1225988018615>)

I've read thousands of pages of scientific publications on climate. Without such reading dam operators would likely have been swamped in recent years by the flood of climate falsities such as yours. Politicians have apparently blindly bought into your unfounded activism. **In the turmoil and sensationalism of emotive drought falsities such as yours have politicians unconsciously applied devastatingly counterproductive pressure to dam operators?**

5.3 Can you now understand how distracting people from real science is detrimental to science, humanity and the environment?

Please refer to pages 48-50 of '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*' first sent to you on December 24, 2009 and again at your request on December 20, 2010 via the link:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

The environmental consequences of falsities distracting people are discussed specifically on pages 1 and 2 of the short, summary document entitled: '*The Eco Fraud: Part 2 Environmental Casualties*' at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%202.pdf

This link was sent to you on December 20, 2010 at your request.

My e-mail to you on March 8, 2010 succinctly explained how claims of global warming fabricated on falsities and unfounded alarm are devastating the environment and humanity.

Additionally, can you see how diverting funds and talent to issues based on falsities reduces the resources available for real research into Nature's floods and reduces the funds for assisting real victims' subsequent recovery?

5.4 Reading the UN IPCC's 2007 report it seems the UN IPCC is deliberately avoiding, masking or downplaying the dominating influences of solar and El Nino drivers of climate and weather. In doing so the UN IPCC is jeopardising Australia and Australians.

For more on this topic please refer to extensive comments by UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray, PhD who has around 60 years real-world science experience including 20 years in climate. He has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports—1990, 1995, 2001, 2007. He has provided by far the most comprehensive, detailed yet succinct review of the entire 2007 report including an amazing 575 comments on your chapter 9 alone.

His comments are easily accessible via www.conscious.com.au.

Specifically, his comments on chapter 9 are at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/gray%20documents/Chapter%209%20UN%20IPCC%20WG1%20AR4%20Vincent%20Gray.pdf

As you were a Review Editor of chapter 9, surely you read his extensive comments on chapter 9, didn't you?

He advises that his comments were never even acknowledged. That seems strange for peer-review processes, doesn't it? As Review Editor weren't you in charge of those peer-review processes?

5.5 Your global warming work seems to have breached basic tests of objectivity and independence. It seems to have bypassed accepted scientific processes and standards. It seems to have even breached UN IPCC guidelines. Why?

David, the 2007 report's chapter 9 is the sole chapter claiming global warming and attributing it to human carbon

dioxide. That chapter apparently built on the equivalent chapter 12 in the UN IPCC's 2001 report. I understand that you were Lead Author of that chapter.

The 2007 report's chapter 9 was produced by a tightly knit cabal of people apparently stacked with computer modellers. Further it apparently built on your own work as Lead Author of the equivalent chapter (12) in the 2001 report. Despite this you were Review Editor of chapter 9.

This raises concerns about the objectivity of the work. It leaves the UN IPCC wide open to doubts as to whether or not peer review was objective. It certainly cannot be seen to be independent, can it?

These concerns are deepened when one considers the UN IPCC's own statistics on its review processes and authorship of papers from a tight knit cabal of authors.

Please refer to the work of John McLean. Links to his work are provided at www.conscious.com.au. The first four of his listed works cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents UN IPCC data on its own reporting processes. The data was obtained from the UN IPCC itself.

His detailed work is supported independently by quotes from eminent UN IPCC scientists. Combined, they prove that within the UN IPCC peer review has been corrupted and often completely bypassed. There have been instances of bureaucrats overturning scientists' conclusions when scientists have stated there is no evidence of human causation of global warming.

In such instances governments and media were handed the political summaries that contradicted the science. Contradicting the science is fraud.

Please refer to pages 11, 12, 28, 30 and 5 of '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*' first sent to you on February 25, 2010 and again at your request on December 20, 2010 via the link: http://www.conscious.com.au/___documents/dead%20elephants.pdf

Pages 9-14 of '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*' provide additional material. http://www.conscious.com.au/___documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

Are you starting to understand my concern about the UN IPCC and your implicit and explicit public falsities?

Please refer to my e-mail of February 25, 2010 to you. It provided an Excel spreadsheet and a PDF document revealing the tight knit cabal of authors of chapter 12 of the 2001 report of which you were Lead Author.

Almost two-thirds (60%) of the references cited by your chapter were written or co-written by the chapter authors. The tight knit cabal of authors was dominated by the UK's Hadley Centre, now infamous world-wide as the core of the Climategate scandal

That scandal has still not been independently investigated. The British Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) inquiry found a breach of the law.

'*The Eco Fraud: Part 1 A timeline of international fraud*' and its associated references '*The Eco Fraud: Climategate 'inquiry' references*' provide additional material. Both were sent to you at your request on December 20, 2010 via the links: http://www.conscious.com.au/___documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf and http://www.conscious.com.au/___documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf

According to UN IPCC guidelines, aren't Lead Authors responsible for ensuring they involve a wide range of authors world-wide? Wasn't that your responsibility David? Yet you apparently breached the guidelines. Why?

5.6 The UN IPCC's 2007 report is not based on peer-reviewed science nor on scientific processes. Falsities emanate from the top of the UN IPCC.

UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri claimed 100% peer-reviewed science in UN IPCC reports. Yet an

independent international audit found the UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies on over five and a half thousand references not peer-reviewed (5,587) including newspaper stories, hikers' anecdotes and political activists' campaign material. This appears to reveal an apparently blatant falsity from the top of the UN IPCC itself, doesn't it?

<http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-main-page.php>

David, I continue awaiting your answers to my questions seeking your understanding of the meaning of 'peer review' and the UN IPCC's meaning of the term. Please refer to my e-mail of December 20, 2010 to you.

5.7 The UN IPCC Chairman publicly stated 4,000 scientists claim global warming caused by human production of CO2. Yet UN IPCC figures themselves reveal only five UN IPCC reviewers endorsed the claim—and there's doubt they were even scientists. ie, not 4,000 scientists, just 5 reviewers.

Please refer to McLean's works presenting UN IPCC data on its own reporting processes. His work cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself.

Australia's previous Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd publicly echoed and spread the UN IPCC Chairman's claim of a scientific consensus of 4,000 scientists. Senior members of the current federal government have repeatedly stated its policy is based on reports by the UN IPCC and that body's supposed scientific consensus.

Can you see how the Australian government, politicians and citizens have been misled into thinking there is a scientific consensus when there is no consensus at all behind the UN IPCC's core claim on human CO2?

Can you please clarify by addressing these deeply troubling concerns with factual data?

There is no **scientific** consensus supporting your claims. Observations show that similar views to yours come from people in positions similar to yours. ie, academics leading university institutes targeting grants from the government's global warming gravy train. I have made many inquiries of such people. Yet, like you, they have all failed to provide me with any real-world scientific evidence of human causation of global warming.

5.8 By implying a falsity you helped fabricate the unfounded notion in Australia of a scientific consensus.

On Monday night, November 9th, 2009, as part of its '4 Corners' program, ABC-TV broadcast your statement, quote: 'Typically there would be one to 2,000 scientific papers published every year in the fields of climate change science contributing to the understanding of climate change science and none of those seriously contradict the conclusions of the IPCC.' The program transcript is available at: <http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2009/s2737676.htm>. Your statement is false.

My subsequent inquiry to you included six references to scientific publications that refuted your claim and exposed your claim as false. Hundreds more were provided via my e-mail to you on December 21, 2010 in response to a request of yours.

Can you now see how your false claim broadcast by ABC-TV's Four Corners falsely reinforces the unfounded public perception of a scientific consensus? Can you now see that the number of people claiming CO2 caused warming is actually very small?

And they lack any real-world scientific evidence.

Are you aware of the thousands of scientists who have stated they refute the UN IPCC's core claim? Are you aware of the number of UN IPCC scientists and internationally eminent scientists opposing the UN IPCC's core claim and exposing its unscientific processes? Are you aware that prominent UN IPCC scientists are leading the spontaneous world-wide people's movement exposing the UN IPCC's fraudulent claim and unscientific practices?

Please refer to the documents mentioned above for evidence and for references to further documents including books by Wishart and by Solomon discussing the eminent scientists exposing UN IPCC falsities.

You are a Lead Author and thus apparently responsible for ensuring your chapter authors provide a thorough, balanced review of the world's literature on climate. I find it astonishing that you can make the claim you made on '4 Corners'. It seems you have either not fulfilled your basic scientific responsibility to become familiar with the literature or you have lied.

With your activism and high profile in the media can you see how its easy for people to draw the conclusion you have deliberately or unconsciously assisted in misleading Australia? If you disagree, please provide facts.

5.9 You are one of the co-authors of the draft of the UN IPCC's highly influential 2007 Summary for Policy Makers (SPM). This document was given to national governments and media yet contains no evidence of global warming due to human production of carbon dioxide. It cleverly implies there is evidence when there is none.

David, it seems you have much personally invested in the UN IPCC's core claim about carbon dioxide. Yet neither your chapter in the UN IPCC's 2001 report, nor your equivalent chapter in its 2007 report nor the Summary for Policy Makers contains any real-world scientific evidence of human warming due to carbon dioxide. Additionally, independent scrutiny finds there is much about the UN IPCC's reports and processes of great concern.

My e-mail of February 25, 2010 corrected a significant error you made in describing the UN IPCC's charter/role/mandate. Thus, in case you are not familiar with the UN IPCC's background and history, please note my understanding: the UN's involvement in fomenting unfounded climate alarm was initially driven by the politicised and unscientific UN Environmental Program, UNEP. In 1988 UNEP co-sponsored the UN IPCC.

According to McLean's research available through www.conscious.com.au, the UN IPCC apparently continued and extended UNEP's unscientific methods of politicising climate reports. It did so to fraudulently fabricate the notion of manmade warming and drive unfounded alarm without evidence.

McLean's work includes extensive quotes from UNEP and UN IPCC officials.
(http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_science_corrupted.pdf)

'*The Eco Fraud: Part 1 A timeline of international fraud*' provides a brief timeline that may be of assistance to you in understanding my concerns. It was sent to you at your request on December 20, 2010 via the link:
http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

The UN IPCC has a history of subverting science to politics. Your role within the UN IPCC has been a leading and substantial role. My conclusion is that your public behaviour and your failure to provide any real-world evidence that human carbon dioxide drives global temperatures makes you culpable for the UN IPCC's impact in diverting political and scientific attention and resources away from real-world weather events.

In my view, your liability is increased by your use of implicit and explicit falsities fomenting unfounded climate alarm in Australia.

Can you see that diversion produces enormous undue risk to Australia and Australians?

Have you read McLean's work? Are you troubled by what the UN IPCC's own data reveal about UN IPCC processes, and especially about your own chapter 9? Could you please comment using factual data?

As an aside, a friend advised me of a recent media report stating that insurance claims by flood victims may be refused because of comments attributing flooding to global warming caused by human CO₂. ie, because the floods are supposedly man-made and not natural disasters. I have not been able to verify his news and am wondering **are you aware of this?**

6. Are you aware of the huge benefits of oil-powered machinery and coal-fired electricity in cleaning-up after Nature's floods and in restoring victims' lives and security?

Having voluntarily assisted flood victims in the week after the floods I've witnessed the huge benefit of volunteers armed with shovels, brooms, hoses and especially with trucks, loaders, fire engines, street sweepers, generators, gurneys,

While volunteering in devastated Goodna with my teenage son it was a delight to be pulled aside by an older resident looking out over the muddy brown park and battered buildings yet see his huge smile as he appreciatively contrasted this with the 1974 clean-up. He marvels at the speed with which the recovery was occurring thanks to the volunteers and especially the machinery. That machinery was powered by oil and energised by the human spirit of care alive in so many volunteers. Despite the floods ravaging his town, he is appreciative—and happy.

His smile while praising the machines is priceless.

These amazing machines are rapidly transforming devastation in the flood plains and assisting people to more quickly recover from Nature's floods.

As reconstruction of houses and businesses gets into full swing, our nation's cheap, abundant, reliable coal-fired electricity will enable builders to restore homes and businesses quickly and economically. This will minimise the floods' impact on our economy and future security.

The role of cheap, reliable energy in recovering from the floods parallels human industrialisation since 1850. Thanks to such energy large portions of humanity are now largely liberated from the harshness and extremes of Nature's climate and weather. The remarkable advances since 1850 were made possible largely by real-world science coupled with freedom and energy.

Flood victims and volunteers have expressed anger and incredulity at your statements. Can your computers model that?

Do you understand why this is important to so many people? Do you appreciate the impact of your explicit and implicit falsities?

7. What are your needs? What is your intent?

From what I've seen here and overseas, every person does their very best. We all do what we think necessary to meet our needs, including our need to contribute to the wider world.

Maybe you see your need as exploring new developments in computer modelling? Or science? Protecting, in some way, the environment? Or humanity? Or maybe, like senior UN IPCC officials, you justify exaggerations, unfounded alarm and falsities as the price to pay for moving people to your agenda.

Or maybe you've been swept up by this culture of fomenting alarm that is documented as existing in the UN IPCC?

Maybe you're enmeshed in protecting your computer models after unvalidated computer projections have proven completely erroneous? Maybe you're attempting to protect your career? Your reputation? Obtain more grants?

Maybe you enjoy the status and media attention that accompanied being part of the UN IPCC? Or seek travelling to meetings and conferences at resorts?

As with your earlier false statements and implied claims, your remarks on January 13th contradict real-world science and real-world data. Given your qualifications in meteorology it seems your statements are knowingly misleading Australia.

The dictionary defines a lie as: a false statement made with deliberate intent to deceive; an intentional untruth; a

falsehood; something intended or serving to convey a false impression; ...

Although I know you have implied and stated falsities, I cannot know your purpose in so doing. Given your background and your financial interest via millions of dollars of taxpayer grants, I am swayed to conclude your falsities are deliberate and thus lies.

I doubt that you're consciously using computer models as a way to obtain grants. I doubt yours is a new form of computer fraud. Instead, from what I've seen in people, telling lies seems to be a form of control. Underlying control is fear.

Given your stance and observing your public actions as the UN IPCC is exposed by the growing public and scientific scrutiny, I'm guessing you may be feeling afraid, vulnerable?

Or, maybe your falsities are unwitting. Maybe you're swept up in the UN IPCC's carefully choreographed momentum. History proves groupthink is powerful. In that case though I conclude your stated and implied comments display scientific negligence or incompetence.

You may not be conscious that you are spreading falsities. Nonetheless, in spreading falsities, David, what is your underlying intent?

My needs in obtaining clarity through answers to my questions and in exposing the UN IPCC's unfounded claims are:

- protecting freedom. Ensuring individual freedom and ensuring Australian sovereignty from the UN FCCC's policies and from UN climate treaties and global financial controls;
- protecting the environment;
- protecting science and scientific integrity—the truth is vital;
- protecting our economy and civilisation from the threat of huge increases in energy prices from politicians reacting in fear to the constant emotive, false bombardment by UNEP since 1972—aided since 1988 by your UN IPCC;
- peace by ending the unfounded global warming fear and guilt constantly raining down on and flooding our kids and communities. Instead, lets restore people's connection with Nature's wonder and abundance.

In recent years, as well as learning more about climate I have been learning more about true forgiveness. Associated with the power of forgiveness, the work of Marshall Rosenberg and my own personal experience shows that knowing one's needs and identifying another person's needs enables both to find ways to fulfil their real needs.

After understanding your needs I'm confident I will be able to assist you in meeting your needs.

David, like its forebear and co-sponsor UNEP, the UN IPCC is corrupt. You have dropped yourself into that mess. Whether you are part of the corruption or an innocent bystander swept up in the fame and attention is not for me to decide. The key decision is now yours: will you cease fomenting unfounded alarm and cease spreading unscientific and false claims?

This is being copied to Professor Andy Pitman, your fellow computer modeller and UN IPCC Lead Author. It is being copied to your fellow activists Professors Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and Tim Flannery. Like you, all three have similarly failed to provide me with real-world evidence of their widely and frequently broadcast unfounded claims of warming due to human CO2.

This e-mail will be forwarded to Dr Megan Clark, CSIRO Chief Executive via her Personal Assistant and to Dr Andrew Johnson, CSIRO Group Executive—Environment. In their written responses to my inquiries, neither has been able to provide any specific real-world scientific evidence justifying CSIRO's support for the UN IPCC's core claim about CO2.

This e-mail will be forwarded to all members of federal parliament, various scientists, friends, the Chairman of the ABC Board, the ABC's Managing Director and the ABC's Chris Uhlmann.

My public declaration of personal interests is freely available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf

8. Two simple requests

Now that your falsities seem to be taking advantage of real-world flooding, trauma, suffering and deaths could you please either justify your claims and assertions or provide an unqualified apology to the victims of Queensland's floods?

Secondly, until you provide specific real-world scientific evidence of your claims and inferences about carbon dioxide and natural phenomenon, could you please refrain from making or implying such claims?

David, the broadcasting of your comments on Thursday, January 13th stimulated my thinking and deepened my concern. From the extensive reading I've done my grounds for the concerns presented above are sincere and clear in my mind. **Nonetheless, if I am in error in any way, I invite and welcome your corrections via real-world scientific evidence and facts.**

Providing you address the fourth topic above by providing specific real-world scientific evidence I will forward your response to all this e-mail's recipients.

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

www.conscious.com.au

180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone:
Home 07 3374 3374
Mobile 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

Abound in the wondrous Oneness of Nature and Life